The allowed ranges of BS/SS Timers should at least give out either minimum or maximum values to enable TSS-TP (Test doc) to use the values for testing purposes.

Proposed Resolution: 
Replace all occurrences of "<" with "<="
Replace all occurrences of ">" with "="
Fix item numbering so it starts with "1"

Additions made during IEEE 802.16 Session #43 in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
From: "Sean Cai"
To: "herbert ruck"
Cc: <r.b.marks@ieee.org>, "Gordon Antonello"
Subject: RE: We have resolved your comment
Date: Thu 9 Mar 2006 21:57:41 -0800
Roger,

I am satisfied with the resolution. I would like to change Disapprove status to Approve.

Regards,
Sean Cai

From: herbert ruck
Sent: Thursday, March 09, 2065

Subject: We have resolved your comment
Dear Sean,
The TGC has accepted your comment on the equal or greater limits for the timer values and the change will be implemented in D7. The details are in the uploaded database. We would appreciate if you would change your NO vote to YES and if you could confirm the change with an e-mail to Roger, Gordon and me. Thank you an best regard
Herbert Ruck

Reason for Group’s Decision/Resolution

Group’s Notes
Group’s Action Items

Editor’s Notes
Editor’s Actions

Editor’s Questions and Concerns
Editor’s Action Items
The tables A.28 and A.72 indicate that all 4 QoS services of 802.16-2004 are supported. However, section 12.4.2.1 Basic Packet PMP profile (OFDMA_ProfM1) only requires support of BE and nrtPS. rtPS and UGS not required and hence optional only. This is true for both SS and BS. PICS and should be corrected for both.

E-mail of May 3, 2006:

From: Rainer Ullmann [rullmann@wavesat.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2006 8:20 AM
To: herbert ruck
Cc: rullmann@wavesat.com; r.b.marks@IEEE.ORG
Subject: RE: Comment #07 on services in the 802.16c-Conformance04 standard

Dear Herbert,

I apologize that I wasn’t able to participate in the recent recirculation process due to business travel and personal absence.

I also had an off site meeting yesterday because of which I missed both your phone calls. Anyhow, you recalled our conversation in Denver absolutely correct – but here it is in writing:

My preferred solution for #7 is:

Section p.24, line 17 (section A.5.2.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.28 )

Below the table add sentence:

At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported.

Section p.44, line 17, (section A.5.3.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.72)

Below the table add sentence:

At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported

The above line numbers, etc refer to IEEE P802.16/Conformance04/D7.

NOTE:

I am not sure whether this is possible at this point but I would like to officially change my vote from “Disapprove” to “Approve”, with comment #7 remaining as “Editorial” only. This reflects that the changes that were already implemented in D7 (i.e all service types optional) were satisfying even if not
2006/05/29

absolutely complete w.r.t. to our discussion about this issue. I hope this resolves your problem in bringing this project to a closing. If not please feel free to contact me again to instruct me how to do so. I will not be attending the Tel Aviv meeting and therefore would like to thank you at this point for doing this thorough job - Good work!

Best regards,
Rainer
Rainer Ullmann, Ph.D

Suggested Remedy
Change in table A.28 status for item 1 and 2 from "m" to "o". Change in table A.72 status for item 1 and 2 from "m" to "o"

Proposed Resolution  Recommendation:  Recommendation by
Part of Disapprove Vote: Yes

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group  Decision of Group: Principle

Page 25, line 6
Table A.28 items 1-4
Change Status from "m" to "o"

Additions made during the IEEE 802.16e meeting in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
1) Change Type "Technical" to "Editorial"

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Additions made during IEEE 802.16 Session #43 in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006

After reviewing the e-mail of May 3rd, the ballot resolution committee reaffirms the decision from IEEE 802.16 Session #42, namely that
the 802.16-2004 standard does not explicitly mandate the support of the services and they are therefore listed as optional in the PICS. Adding the note requested in the e-mail would be equivalent to adding normative text that again is not supported by the standard. The decision is therefore to leave the text as is in P802.16/Conformance04_D7 that was recirculated after the sponsor ballot.

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes
Editor's Actions
k) done

Applied the same resolution to Table A.72 as required by the comment. Table A.72 refers to the BS capabilities and there is a symmetry between the capabilities of the MS and BS thus the entries in tables A.28 (for MS) and A.72 (for BS) should be the same.

Additions made during the IEEE 802.16e meeting in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
Changed Type from "Technical" to "Editorial"

Editor's Questions and Concerns
The comment author suggested in a personal discussion to make it mandatory to implement at least one service.

Editor's Action Items
T19 (item 13) has a "?" for the allowed range. the corresponding table 342 in 802.16-2004 shows no value. I guess anything would pass the "?" requirement - or would nothing pass? P802.16_Cor1/D5 removes this entry completely from the global parameter table....

Suggested Remedy
Remove item 13 (T19) from Table 181

Proposed Resolution
Part of Disapprove Vote: Yes

Reason for Recommendation
Decision of Group: Agree
Page 86, line 32 Table A.181
Remove item 13

Reason for Group’s Decision/Resolution
Addition made following IEEE 802.16 Session #43 in Tel-Aviv, May 8-11, 2006
From: “Rainer Ullmann”
To: “herbert ruck”
Cc: <r.b.marks@ieee.org>
Subject: RE: Comment #07 on services in the 802.16c-Conformance04 standard
Date: Wed, 3 May 2006 09:19:37 -0400

Dear Herbert,

I apologize that I wasn’t able to participate in the recent recirculation process due to business travel and personal absence. I also had an off site meeting yesterday because of which I missed both your phone calls. Anyhow, you recalled our conversation in Denver absolutely correct – but here it is in writing:

My preferred solution for #7 is:

Section p.24, line 17 (section A.5.2.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.28)
Below the table add sentence:
At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported.
Section p.44, line 17, (section A.5.3.3.2.4 Uplink scheduling services, Table A.72)
Below the table add sentence:
At least one of the above scheduling services must be supported

The above line numbers, etc refer to IEEE P802.16/Conformance04/D7.

NOTE:
I am not sure whether this is possible at this point but I would like to officially change my vote from “Disapprove” to “Approve”, with comment #7 remaining as “Editorial” only. This reflects that the changes that were already implemented in D7 (i.e all service types optional) were satisfying even if not absolutely complete w.r.t. to our discussion about this issue. I hope this resolves your problem in bringing this project to a closing. If not please feel free to contact me again to instruct me how to do so. I will not be attending the Tel Aviv meeting and therefore would like to thank you at this point for doing this thorough job - Good work!

Best regards,

Rainer

Rainer Ullmann, Ph.D
Product Line Manager
Wavesat Inc.